

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 1/14/2010 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-12 have been canceled. New claims 13-27 have been added. Limitations of newly added claims have not been found to be patentable over newly discovered prior art and prior art of record, therefore, claims 13-27 are rejected under the new ground rejections as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tankins (USP 1,845,208) in view of Thompson (USP 4,829,156).

Tankins discloses a hair styling device (figs. 1, 2) comprising a pair of pivotally connected handles (23 pivotally connected with hinge 17) and a pair of detachable styling rollers (12) which are connected to un-pivoted ends of the handles, each roller having a heater (13) and an electrical adaptor (36) wherein each roller including a substantially cylindrical barrel with a hair styling surface, wherein the hair styling surface (outer surface of the roller) being substantially symmetrical about a longitudinal axis which the roller being freely rotated; the rollers being rotatable relative to each other

Art Unit: 3732

upon contact styling of hair (col. 3, lines 25-29), wherein said electrical adaptor and the styling roller having an electrical connector for supplying operating power to the heater from the electrical adaptor via the electrical connector as the styling rollers rotate during contact hair of hair (col. 3, lines 6-15 and col. 2, lines 88-95). Tankins fails to show the electrical connector being a rotary electrical interfacing connector, however, Thompson discloses it is known in the art of a hair curling iron to have a rotary electrical interfacing connector (col. 5, lines 54-63). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electrical connector of Tankins with the rotary electrical interfacing connector as taught by Thompson as an alternative way of supplying power of the heater while the styling rollers rotate. In regard to claim 27, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to construct the rotary electrical interfacing connector as taught by modified Thompson with a circular rotary contacts on an outer surface of the roller and stationary contacts of the adaptor arranged to contact the rotary contacts, since such modification would involve a routine skill in the art.

Claims 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tankins in view of Thompson as applied to claims 13, 14 above, and further in view of Andis (USP 4,695,704).

Tankins in view of Thompson discloses the essential claimed invention as discussed in claims 13, 14 above except for the rollers each having a salient styling surface with a plurality of radially protruding teeth. Andis discloses a hair curling iron (fig. 3) comprising a styling roller (10), wherein the roller having a salient styling surface

Art Unit: 3732

with a plurality of teeth (64) extending therefrom. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the hair styling device of Tankins in view of Thompson with the attachment as taught by Andis in order to conveniently comb the user's hair.

Claims 19, 20, 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tankins in view of Thompson as applied to claims 13, 14 above, and further in view of Savone.

Tankins in view of Thompson discloses the essential claimed invention as discussed in claims 13, 21 above except for the rotary electrical connector including a bayonet-type connector. Savone discloses it is known in the art to have a bayonet type connector in the art of hair styling iron (col. 7, lines 20-36). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electrical connector of modify Thompson with the bayonet type connector as taught by Savone as an alternative way of providing electrical power to the styling rollers.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tankins in view of Thompson as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Cox.

Tankins in view of Thompson discloses the essential claimed invention as discussed in claim 21 above except for each of the roller being supported in a main housing in a cradle-like manner. Cox discloses a hair styling device (fig. 8) comprising a pair of styling rollers (9) having a main housing (1, 2). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

Art Unit: 3732

main housing as taught by Cox into the hair styling device of Savone in order to protect the rollers.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tankins in view of Thompson and further in view of Cox as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Savone.

Tankins in view of Thompson and further in view of Cox disclose the essential claimed invention as discussed in claim 24 above except for the rotary electrical connector including a bayonet-type connector. Savone discloses it is known in the art to have a bayonet type connector in the art of hair styling iron (col. 7, lines 20-36). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electrical connector of modified Thompson and further in view of Cox with the bayonet type connector as taught by Savone as an alternative way of providing electrical power to the styling rollers.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13, 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robyn Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robyn Doan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3732